

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

Madeleine Clayton 05/09/2001
Departmental Forms Clearance Officer
Office of the Chief Information Officer
14th and Constitution Ave. NW.
Room 6086
Washington, DC 20230

In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act, OMB has taken the following action on your request for the extension of approval of an information collection received on 01/18/2001.

TITLE: Management and Oversight of the National Estuarine Research Reserve System

AGENCY FORM NUMBER(S): None

ACTION : APPROVED

OMB NO.: 0648-0121

EXPIRATION DATE: 05/31/2004

BURDEN	RESPONSES	BURDEN HOURS	BURDEN COSTS
Previous	43	14,345	0
New	32	14,180	31
Difference	-11	-165	31
Program Change		0	31
Adjustment		-165	0

TERMS OF CLEARANCE: None

NOTE: The agency is required to display the OMB control number and inform respondents of its legal significance (see 5 CFR 1320.5(b)).

OMB Authorizing Official Title

Donald R. Arbuckle Deputy Administrator, Office of
Information and Regulatory Affairs

PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT SUBMISSION

Please read the instructions before completing this form. For additional forms or assistance in completing this form, contact your agency's Paperwork Clearance Officer. Send two copies of this form, the collection instrument to be reviewed, the supporting statement, and any additional documentation to: Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, Office of Management and Budget, Docket Library, Room 10102, 725 17th Street NW, Washington, DC 20503.

1. Agency/Subagency originating request	2. OMB control number b. <input type="checkbox"/> None a. _____ - _____
3. Type of information collection (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> New Collection b. <input type="checkbox"/> Revision of a currently approved collection c. <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of a currently approved collection d. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, without change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired e. <input type="checkbox"/> Reinstatement, with change, of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired f. <input type="checkbox"/> Existing collection in use without an OMB control number For b-f, note Item A2 of Supporting Statement instructions	4. Type of review requested (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Regular submission b. <input type="checkbox"/> Emergency - Approval requested by _____ / _____ / _____ c. <input type="checkbox"/> Delegated 5. Small entities Will this information collection have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No 6. Requested expiration date a. <input type="checkbox"/> Three years from approval date b. <input type="checkbox"/> Other Specify: _____ / _____
7. Title	
8. Agency form number(s) (<i>if applicable</i>)	
9. Keywords	
10. Abstract	
11. Affected public (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "x"</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals or households d. <input type="checkbox"/> Farms b. <input type="checkbox"/> Business or other for-profit e. <input type="checkbox"/> Federal Government c. <input type="checkbox"/> Not-for-profit institutions f. <input type="checkbox"/> State, Local or Tribal Government	12. Obligation to respond (<i>check one</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Voluntary b. <input type="checkbox"/> Required to obtain or retain benefits c. <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory
13. Annual recordkeeping and reporting burden a. Number of respondents _____ b. Total annual responses _____ 1. Percentage of these responses collected electronically _____ % c. Total annual hours requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____	14. Annual reporting and recordkeeping cost burden (<i>in thousands of dollars</i>) a. Total annualized capital/startup costs _____ b. Total annual costs (O&M) _____ c. Total annualized cost requested _____ d. Current OMB inventory _____ e. Difference _____ f. Explanation of difference 1. Program change _____ 2. Adjustment _____
15. Purpose of information collection (<i>Mark primary with "P" and all others that apply with "X"</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Application for benefits e. <input type="checkbox"/> Program planning or management b. <input type="checkbox"/> Program evaluation f. <input type="checkbox"/> Research c. <input type="checkbox"/> General purpose statistics g. <input type="checkbox"/> Regulatory or compliance d. <input type="checkbox"/> Audit	16. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (<i>check all that apply</i>) a. <input type="checkbox"/> Recordkeeping b. <input type="checkbox"/> Third party disclosure c. <input type="checkbox"/> Reporting 1. <input type="checkbox"/> On occasion 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Weekly 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Monthly 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Quarterly 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Semi-annually 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Annually 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Biennially 8. <input type="checkbox"/> Other (describe) _____
17. Statistical methods Does this information collection employ statistical methods <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	18. Agency Contact (person who can best answer questions regarding the content of this submission) Name: _____ Phone: _____

19. Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions

On behalf of this Federal Agency, I certify that the collection of information encompassed by this request complies with 5 CFR 1320.9

NOTE: The text of 5 CFR 1320.9, and the related provisions of 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3), appear at the end of the instructions. *The certification is to be made with reference to those regulatory provisions as set forth in the instructions.*

The following is a summary of the topics, regarding the proposed collection of information, that the certification covers:

- (a) It is necessary for the proper performance of agency functions;
- (b) It avoids unnecessary duplication;
- (c) It reduces burden on small entities;
- (d) It used plain, coherent, and unambiguous terminology that is understandable to respondents;
- (e) Its implementation will be consistent and compatible with current reporting and recordkeeping practices;
- (f) It indicates the retention period for recordkeeping requirements;
- (g) It informs respondents of the information called for under 5 CFR 1320.8(b)(3):
 - (i) Why the information is being collected;
 - (ii) Use of information;
 - (iii) Burden estimate;
 - (iv) Nature of response (voluntary, required for a benefit, mandatory);
 - (v) Nature and extent of confidentiality; and
 - (vi) Need to display currently valid OMB control number;
- (h) It was developed by an office that has planned and allocated resources for the efficient and effective management and use of the information to be collected (see note in Item 19 of instructions);
- (i) It uses effective and efficient statistical survey methodology; and
- (j) It makes appropriate use of information technology.

If you are unable to certify compliance with any of the provisions, identify the item below and explain the reason in Item 18 of the Supporting Statement.

Signature of Senior Official or designee

Date

Agency Certification (signature of Assistant Administrator or head of MB staff for L.O.s, or of the Director of a Program or Staff Office)	
Signature	Date
Signature of NOAA Clearance Officer	
Signature	Date

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR OMB NO. 0648-0121

National Estuarine Research Reserve System

Section A. Justification:

1 & 2. Section 315 of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972 (16 U.S.C. §451), 16 U.S.C. §1461, establishes the National Estuarine Research Reserve System (NERRS). The NERRS consists of carefully selected estuarine areas of the United States that are designated, preserved, and managed for research and educational purposes. The Reserves are chosen to reflect regional differences and to include a variety of ecosystem types according to the classification scheme of the national program as presented in 15 CFR part 921 (49 FR 26502-265201). As part of a national system, the Reserves collectively provide a unique opportunity to address research questions and estuarine management issues of national significance. The reserves also serve to enhance public awareness and understanding of estuarine areas and provide suitable opportunities for public education and interpretation. Regulations provide guidance for delineating reserve boundaries and additional guidance for arriving at the most effective and least costly approach to establishing adequate state control of key land and water areas. Any qualified public or private persons, organization or institutions may compete for research funding to work in research Reserves.

Subsection 315(e)(1)(B) of the CZM Act authorizes the Estuarine Reserves Division (ERD) of the Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management (OCRM) to make grants or cooperative agreements to any coastal state or public or private institution or person for purposes of supporting research within the NERRS. This program is listed in the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance under "Coastal Zone Management Estuarine Research Reserve, Number 11.420". Applications for such grants follow the provisions of OMB Circular A-102. Applications for research grants are required so that ERD can determine which projects best support the NERRS program and merit funding. There are three main types of reporting requirements relating to this program. Applications (SF424s and supporting documentation required by OMB Circulars A-102 and A-110) are required by NOAA to determine if the proposal for funding meets the standards of the Act and implementing regulations, applicable OMB Circulars (most frequently, A-102 Revised, A-110, and A-87), and other applicable laws and regulations.

Additional specific information is required depending upon the type of action or award requested.

- Applications for research awards should contain the names of the potential evaluators. State requests to approve proposed sites must contain the information detailed at §921.11 of the final rule. The information is necessary to ensure that the site meets national standards and requirements for a reserve, to obtain a complete description of the area being proposed, to ensure that the best available site was chosen, and to ensure proper participation by the public and state's Governor.

- After site selection, states may obtain funds for developing a management plan and the data necessary to prepare an environmental impact statement. The requirements are described at §921.13. The management plan is a detailed document that the state uses to establish NOAA-approved goals and objectives for the reserve and as a framework to guide decisions faced in establishing and managing a reserve. The plan must describe the reserve's goals and contain plans for the research and education programs for the reserve, as well as a public access plan. The state must revise the management plan at least every five years, or more often if necessary. This information is needed to ensure that the reserve will meet the objectives the law established for reserves. A resources protection plan is needed to ensure that the resources will continue to be appropriate for conducting the types of research envisaged.

The management plan must also contain plans for any proposed construction and for the acquisition of land and water areas. NOAA must ensure that any construction on the reserve, and which Federal funds help support, are appropriate for the objectives of a reserve. Funding is not to be used, for instance, to build bath houses or other recreational facilities. The acquisition plan is necessary to ensure that the areas being obtained are appropriate and needed for a reserve and that costs are minimized (for instance by obtaining conservation easements instead of purchasing borderlands). The state is not supposed to use the funds to obtain land for other unrelated purposes or purchase greater amounts of land than necessary to achieve the reserve's purpose.

The state must also submit the data necessary for NOAA to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement. Since the state has to gather much of this information or similar information for other purposes, it can obtain it more efficiently than NOAA can. The state also receives Federal funds to do this.

- Applications for acquisition and development awards must include a categorical exclusion check list, Certification of Federal Consistency, state Historical Preservation Office comments, and a preliminary engineering report if the award involves construction projects or restorative activities involving construction.. Before the funds for construction are expended, the categorical exclusion checklist, which is apart of the grant application package for construction and development projects, is submitted to OCRM for approval. The Certification of Federal Consistency, which is also a part of the grant application package for construction and development projects, is a notice signed by an authorized official, such as the coastal program manager or designee from the state coastal management program office indicating that the construction and/or development project is consistent with the goals and policies of the state's coastal management program. This document is submitted as part of the categorical exclusion checklist. The National Historic Preservation Act requires that NOAA obtain the state comments to ensure the Federal government is not funding a project that will harm a site of historical significance. Grant laws and rule require the engineering report so that reviewers can determine that the applicant knows how to perform the requested construction.

- Even though the NERRS regulations do not require the states to submit annual reports/work plans, the Estuarine Reserves Division (ERD) encourages the states to submit these documents to help ensure that national standards are still being met after the reserves' eligibility for Federal operation and management funds have expired (Section 921.40(e)).

3. Extensive effort has been made to establish OCRM on an electronic system for grant applications and reports. The electronic system that has been developed is called Coastal and Marine Management Program (CAMMP) Grant Application and Reporting System (GARS). The CAMMP will facilitate the overall collection, access, analysis, and dissemination of coastal grant data and information at a national level. CAMMP is intended to improve the national and state resource management capabilities of the NERRs. The GARS module streamlines the application process and eventually the performance reporting process, improves state and federal data collection and analysis capabilities, serves as a national database for related information on NERR programs and improves accessibility to coastal resource information. Approximately two-thirds of the NERRs are using the CAMMP Grant Application and Reporting System Module.

The NERRs began using the Internet for their grant applications in March 2000.

4. NOAA is the only agency funding such a program; we are not aware of any similar information being gathered. No similar information is available.
5. The information collection primarily involves state agencies, with a few (if any) small entities involved each year for research grants. We do provide technical assistance in preparing responses, and this reduces the burden.
6. Applications are filed when the applicant requests funds, so this cannot be conducted less frequently.
7. The collection is consistent with OMB Guidelines for Information collections.
8. See the PRA Federal Register notice attached. No comments were received.
9. No payment or gift to respondents were made.
10. No assurance of confidentiality is provided.
11. No sensitive questions are asked.
12. There are currently 20 states and 1 territory involved in this program, and 25 sites. It is anticipated that 2 new sites will be approved for designation. States may have more than one site, and sites may have more than one grant at a time. The routine funding requests are not NOAA burden, since they utilize the SF-424 and the requirements of OMB Circular A-102. To simplify the description of burden, the following focuses upon the number of submissions, rather than respondents.

- 5 management plans are received per year. Most include special acquisition and development information. The burden is 5 plans x 2,000 hours per plan = 10,000 hours.
- 2 site nomination documents for newly proposed NERRS sites. The burden is 2 documents x 2000 hours/report = 4,000 hours.
- 10 annual reports/work plans are received per year. Current burden is estimated as 10 x 15 hours/report = 150 hours.
- 15 applications are expected that will require the categorical exclusion checklist, state Historic Preservation Office comments, a preliminary engineering report for construction projects or restorative activities involving construction, and the Federal Consistency Certification. 15 applications x 2 hr = 30 hrs.

One can calculate respondent/response numbers on either a grantee basis (and ignore that states have multiple grants) or by state (ignoring that state burden depends on the number of grants). Either method causes some confusion, but we will use the grantee approach.

27 grantees submit a total of 32 responses for a total burden of 14,180 hours..

Respondents costs are estimated to be \$322,690 based on a pay rate of \$23/hour for the people working on the responses.

It should also be noted that the anticipated computerization will result in a considerable reduction of burden, but it cannot yet be quantified.

13. With regard to the anticipation of computerization of several documents described above, it is expected that the respondents will have adequate computer equipment of their own. Once the CAMMP system is fully functioning, there will be a minimal cost for preparation and xeroxing of grant documents necessary to acquire appropriate signatures. Estimates of this burden cannot yet be quantified.

Costs are as follows:

- 5 management plans x 350 pages per document x 100 document copies for distribution = 175,000 total pages x .10 xeroxing cost per page = \$17,500. Plus \$4.30 mailing cost per document x 500 total copies = \$2,150. The total cost for management plans is \$19,650.
- 2 site nomination documents x 350 pages per document x 100 document copies for distribution = 70,000 total pages x .10 xeroxing cost per page = \$7000. Plus \$4.30 mailing cost per copy x 200 total copies = \$860. The total cost for site nomination documents is \$7,860.

- 10 annual reports/work plans x 30 pages per document x 75 document copies for distribution = 22,500 total pages x .10 xeroxing cost per page = \$2,250. Plus \$1.21 mailing cost per document x 750 total documents = \$907.50. The total cost for annual reports/work plans is \$3,157.50.
- 15 applications x 60 = 900 total pages x .10 xeroxing cost per page = \$90. Plus \$2.50 mailing cost per document x 15 applications = \$37.50. The total cost for applications is \$127.50.

14. The annual Federal cost associated with collecting, processing, and analyzing the information is about \$85,000. This cost is obtained from estimating personnel time and associated overhead costs.

15. A number of annual reports/work plans submitted has been adjusted from 21 to 10 for a reduction of 165 hours.

16. The results will not be published.

17. The display of the expiration date for OMB approval will be displayed.

18. No exemption is requested.